

APPROVED MINUTES

JOINT MEETING of the STATE REVIEW BOARD and HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD

December 11, 2014, 10:00 a.m.

**Virginia Historical Society Halsey Lecture Hall,
Richmond, VA 23226**

State Review Board Members Present

Dr. Elizabeth Moore, Chair
Dr. Laurant Lee, Vice-Chair
Joseph D. Lahendro
Dr. Gabrielle M. Lanier
Dr. Carl Lounsbury
John Salmon
Dr. Sara Bon-Harper

Historic Resources Board Members Present

Robert Johnson, Chair
William Garner, Vice-Chair
Ashley Atkins-Spivey
Drew Gruber
H. Edward “Chip” Mann
Margaret T. Peters
Terri Hauser

Department of Historic Resources Staff Present

Julie Langan, Director
David Edwards
Marc Wagner
Melina Bezirdjian
Michael Pulice
Aubrey Von Lindern
Jessica Ugarte
Randy Jones

Stephanie Williams, Deputy Director
Jim Hare
Jennifer Loux
Lena Sweeten McDonald
Jennifer Pullen
Wendy Musumeci
Gillian Bears

Guests present (from sign-in sheet) – Wilbert Dean (Buckingham Training School/Ellis Acres); Sandra Esposito (Kenmore Farm); Kelly Gilmer (Samuel Gilmer House); Diane Holman (Buckingham Training School/Ellis Acres); Debra McClane (Thomas C. Creasy House); Carole Nash (Newtown Cemetery); Harold Newman Jr. (Kenmore Farm); Ann Warner (Camp Mont Shenandoah); Harry and Sis Warner (Camp Mont Shenandoah); Beth Reddish Wright (Camp Alkulana); Karen W. Moten (First Baptist Centralia); John D. Clark (First Baptist Centralia); Mrs. Maureen F. Clark (First Baptist Centralia); Mr. Melvin D. Strane, Sr. (First Baptist Centralia); Mr. Thomas Delbridge (First Baptist Centralia); Deacon John C. Baskerville, Ed.D. (First Baptist Centralia); Trustee Frederick J. Friend, Jr. (First Baptist Centralia); Deaconess Mae Elizabeth Friend (First Baptist Centralia); Mamie Rowlett Pierce (First Baptist Centralia); Veronica Friend Strane, Vice Chair (First Baptist Centralia); Deaconess Jane Jiggetts Baskerville, Ph.D., Chair (First Baptist Centralia); Deacon James Holland aka The Honorable James M. “Jim” Holland (First Baptist Centralia)

Guests from State Agencies – Catherine Ayres (Office of the Attorney General)

Historic Resources Board (HRB)

Chair Robert Johnson called the HRB meeting to order at 10:15 a.m., and welcomed everyone in attendance. Chair Johnson explained the role of the HRB and asked each member to introduce themselves. Chair Johnson presented the minutes for the October 30, 2014 Board training meeting. With a motion from Mr. Mann and a second from Ms. Hauser, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the minutes. Chair Johnson then presented the September 18, 2014 meeting minutes. Mr. Gruber requested that a correction be made to the minutes for the Fall Hill Roadway Easement Reconsideration from the afternoon session of the HRB meeting. Mr. Gruber noted that the vote was not unanimous and there should be an abstention for Mr. Gruber. With a motion from Mr. Mann and a second from Vice-Chair Garner, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the minutes from the September 2014 meeting with the correction requested by Mr. Gruber.

State Review Board (SRB)

Chair Elizabeth Moore called the SRB meeting to order, and welcomed everyone in attendance. Chair Moore explained the role of the SRB and the process of designation, and invited each board member to introduce themselves. She then presented the September 18, 2014 meeting minutes. With a motion from Dr. Lounsbury and a second from Dr. Lanier, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the minutes. Chair Moore then presented the minutes for the October 30, 2014 Board training meeting. With a motion from Mr. Lahendro and a second from Vice-Chair Lee the SRB voted unanimously to approve the minutes from the October Board training meeting.

Director’s Report (DHR)

Director Langan began her report with an announcement regarding the sudden passing of Pamela Schenian, a DHR employee who worked in the Tidewater Region Preservation Office. The TRPO has been closed temporarily. The sole staff member in the TRPO,

Ms. Schenian had been with the Department for more than six years. The meeting paused for a moment of silence in memory of Ms. Schenian.

Director Langan introduced two new DHR staff members, Aubrey Von Lindern, architectural historian in the Northern Region Preservation Office and Jessica Ugarte, tax credit review specialist with the Office of Preservation Incentives.

Director Langan provided a budget update, noting that the Governor's budget would be announced on December 17. DHR expected cuts of 5% for the current fiscal year and 7% for the next fiscal year. Director Langan reported that the \$1 million Civil War Site Preservation Fund appropriation from the General Assembly has been approved for the current state fiscal year. Funding for next year is not finalized yet. For the federal Historic Preservation Fund, expectations are that the funding level will remain level from last year. DHR continues to work on the comprehensive planning process. More than 1,000 respondents have participated in the online survey. Focus groups have been conducted as planned, and DHR staff participated in the annual Virginia Preservation conference in October. Stakeholder interviews will take place in the coming months. The conclusions and proposals reached through the planning process will be presented at the joint Board meeting in March 2015. Director of Administration Jennifer Mayton resigned in November 2014. Interviews have taken place and an offer made to the top candidate. DHR will seek permission to hire a staff person for TRPO. No other additions to staff are planned. Director Langan notified Board members of the Preservation Virginia Legislative Reception to take place on February 5 in Richmond. Also in 2015, the National Trust for Historic Preservation annual conference will take place November 3-6 in Washington DC. It will mark the kickoff for the 50th anniversary celebration of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Director Langan discussed the proposed Dominion electrical transmission line across the James River. The John Smith Water Trail has been identified as a cultural resource but not yet evaluated for National Register eligibility. In Charlotte Court House, there is a proposed expansion to the court facilities. Both of these projects have received considerable attention and public comment. Regarding Fort Monroe, Governor McAuliffe has expressed interest in the National Park Service having a bigger role at the property than originally contemplated. DHR staff are involved in the planning process.

Director Langan reminded Board members to complete their travel reimbursement forms and to complete their Conflict of Interest Disclosure by December 15. During today's lunch break, Board members are invited to visit DHR's exhibit on Werowocomoco in the new Weinstein Education Center at the Virginia Historical Society.

Director Langan invited Survey & Register Division Director Jim Hare to speak about the Hurricane Sandy and Cost Share programs. With regard to the Hurricane Sandy grants, DHR is in the process of getting Virginia's sub-grant agreement drafted and approved. To date, there are ten grant recipients, with two already having received approval. DHR has approximately \$800,000 yet to commit, and plans to work with the affected areas to identify projects that would be most beneficial. Projects are likely to include architectural and archaeological surveys, emergency planning, and sea level rise initiatives. Cost Share grants have been finalized and procurement is in progress. Margaret Peters requested a list of recipients for the Hurricane Sandy grant funds. Director Langan said this will be provided, along with Cost Share recipients. Work on Certified Local Government grants will begin in January.

Vice-Chair Garner asked about presenting a posthumous commendation for Ms. Schenian to be presented to Ms. Schenian's daughter at the March 2015 joint board meeting. Director Langan agreed that this can be accomplished. Vice-Chair Lee asked if the TRPO will remain a one-person office and Director Langan said yes. Qualifications for that position will start being discussed on Monday. Ms. Atkins Spivey asked about the James River transmission line project and whether the consultation process will include state-recognized tribes. Director Langan said tribal representatives were present at the first consulting parties meeting. She noted that the Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for consulting with tribes and other consulting parties, and she can request a list of the contacts they are using. Director Langan agreed that tribal consultation will be important to identify the full range of cultural resources.

Chair Johnson commended Director Langan and DHR staff for their work in a time of limited resources and reduced budgets.

Board of Historic Resources:

Director Langan introduced Deputy Director Williams, who presented an overview of the Emergency Regulations process and proposed revisions to existing regulations in response to the recent situation with the Ashburn Historic District. Deputy Director Williams began with a review of the enabling state legislation and regulations in the Code of Virginia and the Virginia Administrative Code. Two sets of emergency regulations were presented. One pertains to the Board of Historic Resources, and the other to the State Review Board. Amended language is identical in both. The first revision clarifies that notifications sent to property owners and notifications of public hearings are taken from current real estate tax assessment books at the time the notifications are prepared. For the owner objection process, the language has been amended to state that 7 business days prior to a Board meeting, a written and attested notarized statement from property owners is required to object to a proposed nomination. Catherine Ayres, Office of the Attorney General, noted that prior to the amendments, the regulations did not have a specific date by which objections had to be provided prior to a Board meeting. Deputy Director Williams said that in addition to a letter of objection, an attested and certified copy of the recorded deed of ownership is to be submitted. Additional language has been added to allow DHR staff 30 days to prepare for reconsideration of a nomination previously opposed by a majority of property owners.

Deputy Director Williams said that if the emergency regulations are approved by the Boards today, they will be placed in the Town Hall online database for executive branch review. The Office of the Attorney General, the Department of Planning and Budget, the Secretariat of Natural Resources, and the Governor's Office will review the emergency regulations. Vice Chair Garner asked if review by the Governor's Office was the last step in the process. Deputy Director Williams said the Governor's Office is the last step and then DHR can file the emergency regulations for the Department of the Registrar and they will take effect. DHR hopes to have the regulations in effect by the next joint review board meeting in March 2015. The emergency regulations can remain in effect for 18 months, with an extension of up to 6 months permitted. Concurrent with placing the emergency regulations in effect, DHR will begin the process for promulgating permanent changes to the regulations through the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA). The NOIRA process and all proposed changes are subject to executive branch review and public comment.

Dr. Bon-Harper asked about the text "then current records on the books" and asked if a single designated repository exists for property owner records. Ms. Ayres said it is generally accepted that what is used are current tax records, which can be online or in hard copy format. The reason that "then current" is used is to take into account that transfers in ownership can occur after a notification takes place. Dr. Bon-Harper suggested tightening the language to include the then current "externally" available records to address the lag time between when the property changes hands and when it appears online. Ms. Ayres responded that to address this issue the revised regulations required the property owner to provide a copy of the deed to show current ownership. Dr. Bon-Harper asked if the language could refer to the exact records to be used instead of simply "the books." Ms. Ayres noted that was the term that was previously used in the regulations and that the language could be revised and the Boards did not have to vote today. Deputy Director Williams said the language can be refined between the emergency regulations and the permanent changes to regulations.

Ms. Hauser observed that she understood the need for the changes and the revisions seemed to be clarifying the regulations to remove ambiguities. She asked about the 7-business day requirement, and wanted to ensure that property owners have adequate time to respond given the date of the notification mailing. Ms. McDonald explained the difference between notifications for historic districts versus individual property nominations, and the time frames in which notifications are sent for each. Ms. Ayres said that if the emergency regulations are approved, then an additional 10 days to the notification schedule will be added, meaning that notifications will be sent about 10 days earlier (70 days in the case of historic districts; 40 days in the case of individual nominations, as opposed to the current 60 and 30 days respectively). Director Langan said one of the reasons DHR wants to have a time by which someone provides a letter of objection is to make sure the agency has enough time to receive the letter and that the 7-day requirement also lessens the likelihood of DHR staff missing a mailed letter in the event that staff have traveled to a Board meeting location the day before the meeting. Ms. Hauser responded that she agreed, but wanted to make sure the owners still had enough time. Director Langan stated yes and the notification process would be backed up to ensure adequate response time.

Deputy Director Williams asked the Board of Historic Resources to vote to adopt the Emergency Regulations and to give the DHR Director power to promulgate the permanent regulations. Chair Johnson asked for a motion to accept the emergency regulations as presented. Ms. Peters moved to adopt the emergency regulations and give the DHR Director the power to promulgate them. With a second from Mr. Mann, the motion passed unanimously.

The State Review Board did not take a vote on the emergency regulations because that body does not vote on state regulations.

Jim Hare presented two properties for delisting from the Virginia Landmarks Register due to their demolition: the Eight-Foot High Speed Tunnel (DHR No. 114-0139) and the Full Scale 30 x 60 Foot Tunnel (DHR No. 114-0142), both in the City of Hampton. He explained the historic significance of each property and the decommissioning process conducted by NASA during the early 2000s. The mitigation for each property's demolition consisted of detailed HABS documentation. He asked the Board of Historic Resources to delist each property from the Virginia Landmarks Register. Ms. Hauser asked when DHR was made aware of the properties' demolition and how a historic resource was demolished. Mr. Hare explained how the properties were delisted from the National Register of Historic Places by the Keeper of the Register. Vice-Chair Garner observed it seemed counterintuitive to delist a property after it was demolished. Director Langan explained that a Programmatic Agreement between the NPS, ACHP, NCSHPO, and NASA provides a process for evaluating and delisting underutilized historic properties. Ms. Hauser asked if any kinds of efforts were made to move the smaller building. Director Langan said part of the mitigation included placing some elements of each property on display at appropriate locations. Ms. Musumeci said part of one of the tunnels is on exhibit at the Air and Space Museum in Hampton. With a motion from Ms. Hauser and a second from Mr. Mann, the HRB voted unanimously to remove each property from the Virginia Landmarks Register.

NOMINATIONS

Marc Wagner presented the following nominations:

1. Buckingham Training School, Town of Dillwyn, Buckingham County, #208-5001, Criteria A and C
2. Kenmore Farm, Amherst County, #005-0023, Criteria A and C

Comments made:

Chair Moore invited each property's owners to speak. Mr. Wilbert Dean, Buckingham Training School, thanked both Board members and explained how the property is still used for education purposes through partnerships with the Buckingham County school system and the community college system. Chair Lee said the two nominations offer different but important perspectives on education in Virginia.

Chair Johnson asked for a motion to approve both nominations as presented. With a motion from Ms. Hauser and a second from Ms. Peters, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the nominations.

Chair Moore asked for a motion to approve both nominations as presented. With a motion from Dr. Lanier and a second from Mr. Lahendro, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the nominations.

Melina Bezirdjian presented the following nominations for the Northern Region

1. Camp Alkulana Historic District, Bath County, #008-5049, Criteria A and C, Criteria Consideration A
2. Camp Mont Shenandoah Historic District, Bath County, #008-5048, Criteria A and C
3. Newtown Cemetery, City of Harrisonburg, #115-5129, Criterion A

Comments made:

Randy Jones thanked community members Karen Thomas and Ruth Tolliver, who assisted with the research and preparation of the Newtown Cemetery nomination, and the nomination co-authors, George Mason University faculty member Carole Nash and graduate student Mary Ann Mason.

Dr. Nash said the Newtown Cemetery is a classic example of a significant place hiding in the open. She noted the cemetery was established independently by freedmen and the cemetery's history since then has been important to Harrisonburg's history.

Mr. Harold Newman Jr., owner of Kenmore Farm, acknowledged Sandra Esposito, Wendy Musumeci, and Gillian Bearn for their contributions to documenting Kenmore Farm.

Beth Wright, director of Camp Alkulana, said the nomination process had been a journey that began with preparing for the camp's centennial in 2017. The camp continues to operate in the tradition of the settlement house movement to provide summer camp opportunities for urban youth. She noted the historical link between Camp Alkulana and Camp Mont Shenandoah, and the importance of that association.

Mr. Lahendro asked if both camps are being nominated under Criterion C for their architectural significance. Ms. McDonald said that given the historic association and parallels in the camps' development, that it made sense to nominate each property under the same criteria. She said that the nominations would benefit from having further discussion of one another in their respective nominations to flesh out the discussion more effectively. Ms. McDonald said that copies of the revised nominations would be provided to the Board members.

Chair Johnson commented on the community involvement that made each nomination a success. He asked for a motion from the HRB to approve the nominations. With a motion from Mr. Mann and a second from Ms. Hauser, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the nominations.

Chair Moore asked for a motion from the SRB to approve the nominations. Mr. Lahendro moved to approve the nominations, with the understanding that the two camp nominations will be amended with additional information under Criterion C. With a second from Dr. Lanier, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the nominations.

Mr. Mann, Ms. Peters, and Ms. Atkins-Spivey left the meeting and returned during the presentation of Item #1: Thomas Claiborne Creasy House below.

Ms. Debra McClane presented the following nomination for the Western Region:

1. Thomas Claiborne Creasy House, Town of Gretna, Pittsylvania County, #227-5003, Criteria B and C

Mr. Pulice presented the following nominations for the Western Region:

1. Samuel Gilmer House, Russell County, #083-0003, Criterion C
2. Sayers Homestead, Lee County, #052-0340, Criterion C
3. Tazewell Depot, Town of Tazewell, Tazewell County, #158-5052, Criteria A and C

Comments made:

Mr. Kelly Gilmer thanked the DHR staff, particularly Mr. Pulice, for their assistance and advice in preparing the nomination for the Samuel Gilmer House.

Chair Moore asked for questions and comments from the boards. Ms. Peters said that Criterion A could be applied to the Sayers House, especially with the availability of agricultural census records. Its location in far western Virginia places it out of the mainstream from agricultural contexts elsewhere in Virginia. Mr. Pulice said that the property was evaluated under Criterion C in 1994 and that was used in the nomination. Although the property has historic associations with agriculture, staff time and resource constraints prevented him from nominating the property under every possible area of significance, and that there is not a requirement to do so as long as the primary area

of significance is used. Ms. Peters said that inclusion of agricultural outbuildings in the nomination is sufficient to illustrate the historic association.

Chair Johnson asked for a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Vice-Chair Garner and a second from Mr. Mann, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the nominations.

Chair Moore asked for a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Vice-Chair Lee and a second from Mr. Lahendro, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the nominations as presented.

Dr. Lanier departed the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

Ms. McDonald presented the following nomination for the Tidewater Region:

1. Amblers, James City County, #047-0043, Criterion C

Comments made:

SRB member Carl Lounsbury recused himself from voting on the nomination because he coauthored it, but remained in the room to answer questions.

Chair Moore asked if there are plans for the property's use. Mr. Lounsbury said yes, but those plans have not yet been clearly defined. He noted that local preservationists sought the nomination in part to remind the county Board of Supervisors of the property's architectural significance. Mr. Gruber asked why the property is not being nominated under Criterion D for archaeology. Ms. McDonald explained that the property is within the Governor's Land Archaeological District, but that district's period of significance ends in the late eighteenth century. The architectural resources are not contributing to the archaeological district, but the land on which the buildings sit do contribute to the archaeological district. The period of significance for Amblers is 1852 through the early 1950s, and professional testing of cultural deposits has not yet taken place to establish the integrity of archaeological resources from this time period. Therefore, the property is not nominated under Criterion D at this time, but the nomination could be updated at a later time of professional investigations do take place.

Mr. Lounsbury left the room prior to the Boards' vote on the nomination.

Chair Johnson asked for a motion for the HRB to approve the nomination as presented. With a motion from Ms. Hauser and a second from Ms. Peters, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the nomination.

Chair Moore asked for a motion for the SRB to approve the nomination as presented. With a motion from Vice-Chair Lee and a second from Dr. Bon-Harper, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the nomination.

The joint meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD

Historic Resources Board Members Present

Chair Robert Johnson
Vice-Chair William Garner
Drew Gruber
Terri Hauser
H. Edward "Chip" Mann
Margaret Peters
Ashley Atkins-Spivey

Department of Historic Resources Staff Present

Julie Langan
Stephanie Williams
Jen Pullen
Elizabeth Tune
Wendy Musumeci
Gillian Bearn
Jen Loux
Megan Melinat
Joanna Wilson Green

Guests present (from sign-in sheet) – Karen W. Moten (First Baptist Centralia); John D. Clark (First Baptist Centralia); Mrs. Maureen F. Clark (First Baptist Centralia); Mr. Melvin D. Strane, Sr. (First Baptist Centralia); Mr. Thomas Delbridge (First Baptist Centralia); Deacon John C. Baskerville, Ed.D. (First Baptist Centralia); Trustee Frederick J. Friend, Jr. (First Baptist Centralia); Deaconess Mae Elizabeth Friend (First Baptist Centralia); Mamie Rowlett Pierce (First Baptist Centralia); Veronica Friend Strane, Vice Chair (First Baptist Centralia); Deaconess Jane Jiggetts Baskerville, Ph.D., Chair (First Baptist Centralia); Deacon James Holland aka The Honorable James M. “Jim” Holland (First Baptist Centralia); Catherine Ayres, Office of the Attorney General

Call to Order..... Robert Johnson, Chair, Board of Historic Resources

Chair Robert Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m. Chair Johnson explained the role of the Historic Resources Board and asked each member to introduce themselves. A. Atkins-Spivey joined the meeting at 1:41 p.m. R. Johnson, Chair, W. Garner, Vice-Chair, D. Gruber, T. Hauser, C. Mann, M. Peters, and A. Atkins-Spivey composed the Historic Resources Board (the “Board”).

Intent to Transfer Non-Native American Human Remains to the National Museum of Natural History

J. Wilson Green, Easement and Stewardship Archaeologist, briefed the Board on the Department of Historic Resources’ (“DHR”) intent to transfer certain non-Native American human remains to the Smithsonian/National Museum of Natural History (“National Museum”). Ms. Wilson Green summarized the presentation she made to the Board at the September 18, 2014, meeting and noted that DHR now had an updated analysis for forty-four sets of remains. She commented that per the Board’s request, DHR was still trying to initiate consultation with the African-American community regarding the remains that have been identified as being of African or African-American descent.

Ms. Wilson Green requested the Board’s final approval for transfer of the non-Native American and non-African/African-American human remains to the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of Natural History while retaining the African-American remains until consultation was complete. Wilson Green informed the Board that she hoped to have an update on the consultation process for their review at the March 2015 meeting.

With a motion from Vice-Chair Garner and a second from Mr. Mann, the HRB voted unanimously to approve transfer of the non-Native American and non-African/African-American remains to the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of Natural History.

HIGHWAY MARKERS

J. Loux, Highway Marker Historian, introduced herself to the Board. Vice-Chair Garner made a motion to change the order of the Highway Marker portion of the agenda so that Item #4 in the Sponsor Marker-Diversity category (First Baptist Church Centralia) could be reviewed first in recognition of community members in attendance at the meeting. Mr. Mann seconded the motion and the HRB voted unanimously to approve the agenda change.

Sponsor Markers – Diversity

J. Loux presented the First Baptist Church (Centralia) to the HRB.

1. First Baptist Church (Centralia)

Sponsor: First Baptist Church History Committee

Locality: Chesterfield County

Proposed Location: near 4412 Centralia Road, Chester

Dr. Jane J. Baskerville, Chair of the First Baptist Church Centralia History Committee spoke in support of the application for the historic marker and provided an overview of the church’s history.

With a motion from Mr. Mann and a second from Ms. Atkins-Spivey, the HRB voted unanimously to approve Item #1, the First Baptist Church (Centralia) marker.

Ms. Loux then presented the remaining items in the Sponsor Marker-Diversity, Sponsor Markers, and Replacement Marker categories and requested that the Board vote on all the proposed markers as a group at the end of her presentation.

2. Pauline Weeden Maloney (1904-1987)

Sponsor: The Lynchburg chapter of The Links, Inc.

Locality: Lynchburg

Proposed Location: 1316 Buchanan Street

3. Patrick Robert “Parker” Sydnor (1854-1950)

Sponsor: Literacy InterActives, Inc.

Locality: Mecklenburg County

Proposed Location: SR 49 at intersection with Route 701 (Wilbourne Road)

4. High Street Baptist Church

Sponsor: City of Danville

Locality: Danville

Proposed Location: 630 High Street

5. Edgar Amos Love (1891-1974)

Sponsor: Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc.

Locality: Harrisonburg

Proposed Location: John Wesley United Methodist Church, 445 Sterling Street

6. People's Memorial Cemetery

Sponsor: City of Petersburg

Locality: Petersburg

Proposed Location: 334 S. Crater Road

Sponsor Markers

1. Origins of 4-H in Virginia

Sponsor: Virginia Cooperative Extension

Locality: Dinwiddie County

Proposed Location: Intersection of SR 40 and SR 610, near McKenney

2. Moore Family

Sponsor: Historic Pocahontas, Inc.

Locality: Tazewell County

Proposed Location: SR 644, 5.5 miles west of town of Pocahontas

Replacement Marker

1. Assassin's End (Replacement of John Wilkes Booth EP-20 marker, recently stolen)

Sponsor: Surratt Society

Locality: Caroline County

Proposed Location: Route 301, Fort A.P. Hill

Ms. Loux clarified that the sponsor for Item #5, Edgar Amos Love, was the Love BDD Foundation, a philanthropic arm of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity. Ms. Loux presented a proposed revision to the first sentence of the marker text for Item #2, Moore Family, in the Sponsor Marker category and explained that the change in text was intended to provide a broader historic context for the marker.

Vice-Chair Garner observed that the new language for the Assassin's End marker in the Replacement Marker category was an improvement. Chair Johnson inquired if there were any leads on who stole the marker and Ms. Loux responded no. Ms. Peters commended Ms. Loux for her craftsmanship and editing skills with regard to the markers. Mr. Gruber noted that he was excited to see that the Virginia Cooperative Extension sponsored the 4-H marker.

With a motion from Ms. Hauser and a second from Mr. Gruber, the HRB voted unanimously to approve Items #2-#6 (Sponsor Markers-Diversity), Items #1-#2 (Sponsor Marker), and Item #1 (Replacement Marker) with the text revisions proposed by Ms. Loux.

Presentation of Local Marker Designs for the Town of Herndon.....presented by Jen Loux

With a motion from Ms. Hauser and a second from Mr. Gruber, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the design for the Town of Herndon local marker.

EASEMENTS

W. Musumeci, Easement Program Coordinator, introduced herself to the Board and presented the following four new easement offers. W. Musumeci requested that the Board vote individually for each item.

Easements for Consideration

1. Historic Long Bridge Road Tract, Deep Bottom and Glendale Battlefields, Henrico County

Property Owners: Mark D. and Karen M.K. Perreault

Acres: 3.87

The 3.87-acre property is within the core and/or study areas of four Civil War battlefields: First Deep Bottom, Second Deep Bottom, Glendale, and Chaffin's Farm/New Market Heights. The property is highly visible from Route 5 and Long Bridge Road. It includes one non-historic garage/workshop building, which is in the process of being dismantled. The landowners would like to use the property for agricultural purposes in the future and sell related products at a temporary farm stand. Ms. Musumeci stated that the Easement Acceptance Committee recommended approval of the easement as proposed.

Ms. Atkins-Spivey asked what type of agricultural production was intended and if there was a concern about archaeological resources. Ms. Musumeci responded that small scale crop production was anticipated and that general agricultural crop production practices, particularly no-till farming, did not cause significant ground disturbance that would impact archaeological deposits.

With a motion from Ms. Peters and a second from Vice-Chair Garner, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the easement as presented.

2. Downing Tract, First Kernstown Battlefield, Frederick County

Property Owner: Donna Wilkins Downing, Trustee for John Patrick Downing and Edward Wilkins Downing, under contract to Civil War Trust ("CWT")

Acres: 35.95

Located along Apple Valley Road (State Route 652) just southwest of Winchester, the Downing Tract is unimproved and comprised almost entirely of wooded cover. The property falls within the core and study areas of the First and Second Kernstown Battlefields as well as the study area of the Second Winchester Battlefield. The CWT intends to acquire the property in fee with grant funding assistance from the American Battlefield Protection Program and the Virginia Civil War Site Preservation Fund. Ms. Musumeci explained that it was not clear from the information submitted with the Easement Application Form whether or not the property had been previously platted for development.

Ms. Musumeci stated that the Easement Acceptance Committee recommended approval of the easement with the following conditions:

1. If a plat for subdivision of the property has been previously recorded with Frederick County, it needs to be vacated. Additionally, any internal lot lines established prior to recordation of the easement also need to be vacated.
2. Because the property contains more than 20 acres of forested or wooded cover, the easement will require that a Forest Management Plan be completed.
3. Any rehabilitation or restoration of the landscape shall be conducted according to a written management plan negotiated jointly by the Civil War Trust and the DHR, and such plan shall be incorporated into the easement either directly or by reference.

Mr. Gruber asked if there was any indication that metal detecting was ever permitted by the property owner. Ms. Musumeci responded that this question was on the Easement Application Form and the response was no. Vice-Chair Garner asked if the donor was willing to complete a Forest Management Plan. Ms. Musumeci responded yes, that the CWT was aware of the Easement Acceptance Committee's conditions for approval of the easement.

With a motion from Mr. Mann and a second from Mr. Gruber, the HRB voted unanimously to accept the easement as presented.

Mr. Mann left the meeting.

3. Flint Hill Academy, Goose Creek Rural Historic District, Loudoun County

Property Owners: E. Prescott and Stephanie M. Engle

Acres: 10.01

Flint Hill Academy lies along the north side of Hughesville Road (State Route 725) west of the Town of Leesburg. The property was designated a contributing resource to the Goose Creek Rural Historic District (RHD), which was listed in the Virginia Landmarks Register on July 21, 1981, and the National Register of Historic Places on November 14, 1982. Flint Hill Academy contains three main sections: the one-and one-half story original log and frame structure (c. 1790) with a later rear shed addition, a two-story c. 1840 frame section, and two-story c. 1870 frame section. In 1993, a one-story addition was constructed on the north end of the dwelling. According to a survey made by DHR in 1972, the building was altered in the 1960s, including the installation of new interior doors, removal of interior walls, and installation of a bay window and sliding glass doors on the rear elevation. The second floor windows of the c. 1790 log section were also replaced sometime after 1972 and the trim around the exterior primary entry was replaced. Ms. Musumeci briefed the Board on additional alterations that had been made to the dwelling by the current owner, such as replacement of windows in the first floor of the log portion.

She explained that as a contributing resource to the Goose Creek Rural Historic District, the Flint Hill Academy property meets the threshold criteria for DHR's easement program. However, when reviewing the application, the Easement Acceptance Committee considered other factors, including whether or not the building conveyed its historic character, and whether it retained integrity in its historic materials and construction methods. Ms. Musumeci noted that after careful consideration the Committee did not recommend acceptance of the easement due to the extent of non-historic alterations that have been made, changes to the façade, interior alterations,

and construction of new additions. Per the property owner's request, the project is being presented to the Board for reconsideration of the Easement Acceptance Committee's recommendation.

Chair Johnson inquired if there was any merit to the donor's request that the Board reconsider the Easement Acceptance Committee's recommendation and if additional documentation was submitted. Ms. Musumeci responded that the Easement Acceptance Committee was comprised of historic preservation professionals and pointed out that many donors are emotionally connected to their home or residence. Chair Johnson asked for confirmation that the owner was challenging the decision. Director Langan stated that she had spoken with the owner and at the suggestion of the Office of the Attorney General, offered to present the application to the Board. Mr. Gruber asked when the owner purchased the property. Ms. Musumeci responded she did not know the specific date, but it was after 1993. Mr. Gruber stated that actions recently taken by the owner, such as window replacement, and the owner's intentions for use of the property were not entirely consistent with the easement program. Ms. Musumeci responded that was part of the reason why DHR directed the owner to alternate easement holders and provided specific contact information for those holders. Ms. Atkins-Spivey asked if there was any associated historic significance on the ten acres of land. Ms. Musumeci noted that information in DHR's archives about the history of the property was limited and she presented the information that was available. Mr. Garner asked about the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Musumeci clarified the composition of the Easement Acceptance Committee, noting it included the Director, Deputy Director, and other division directors. Chair Johnson observed that the Board highly respects the Department's review process and without new information presented by the donor, reconsideration seems an entirely emotional request. Ms. Peters observed that she respected the owner's feelings, but the integrity of the program needs to be maintained and in this circumstance it would be a disservice to go against the recommendation of the Easement Acceptance Committee, plus staff offered the owner alternatives.

With a motion from Ms. Peters and a second from Vice-Chair Garner, the HRB voted unanimously not to accept the easement as presented.

4. 114 Edwards Ferry Road, Leesburg Historic District, Loudoun County

Property Owner: 114 Edwards Ferry Road, LLC

Acres: approx. 0.27

Centrally located within the Town of Leesburg, the building at 114 Edwards Ferry Road is situated on a rectangular-shaped urban lot surrounded by a paved parking area. Although originally constructed as a dwelling, the building is currently utilized as commercial office space. This building has been designated a contributing resource to the Leesburg Historic District, which was listed in the Virginia Landmarks Register in 1969 and the National Register of Historic Places in 1970. In 2002, the boundaries of the district were expanded and the nomination was updated. The building at 114 Edwards Ferry Road is a 2-story, 3-bay frame vernacular building with a gable end façade distinguished by bracketed cornice returns and corner posts. The primary entry on this façade has a bracketed pedimented hood with transom and flanking sidelights. There is a 1-story, 1-bay side ell with a shed roof located on the west elevation and one interior brick chimney. A substantial 2-story, 3-bay frame addition has been constructed to the rear of the original dwelling. DHR's archival records show it was constructed sometime between 1971 and 1998. Archival photographs also indicate that between 1971 and 1998 the existing 2-over-2 double-hung windows on the building were replaced with 1-over-1 wood frame windows, existing wood louvered shutters were replaced with paneled shutters, and the foundation was altered. During this time the pediment over the front entry and flanking sidelights were also constructed and the double bracketed corners at the roofline were changed to single brackets. Alterations have also been made to interior architectural features and spaces.

Ms. Musumeci explained that as a contributing resource to the Leesburg Historic District, the property located at 114 Edwards Ferry Road meets the threshold criteria for DHR's easement program. However, when reviewing the application, the Easement Acceptance Committee considered other factors, including whether or not the building conveyed its historic character, and whether it retained integrity in its historic materials and construction methods. Ms. Musumeci noted that after careful consideration the Committee did not recommend acceptance of the easement due to the extent of non-historic alterations that have been made, such as replacement of historic windows, construction of a large rear addition that is incompatible in terms of massing, scale, and design with the historic building, alterations to the primary historic entry and bracketed cornice, and substantial interior alterations. Per the property owner's request, the project is being presented to the Board for reconsideration of the Easement Acceptance Committee's recommendation.

Chair Johnson commented that he had the same question as before, which was whether staff received additional information from the owner in response to the Easement Acceptance Committee's recommendation. Ms. Musumeci responded that the answer was no, although the changes to this building were not made by the current owner. Ms. Hauser inquired about the importance of protecting the streetscape and if this easement would help. Ms. Musumeci responded that the property was on the edge of the historic district and was used for commercial purposes and showed a map of other easements held by the Board in the vicinity which tended to have larger acreage amounts. Ms. Peters observed that the threshold for the easement was listing on the Virginia Landmarks Register but the Easement Acceptance Committee could consider other factors. She explained that this property would not meet the standards for individual eligibility or even a façade easement. Ms. Musumeci stated that the Easement Acceptance Committee questioned whether the property would still be considered a contributing resource, given the impact of alterations made over time. Ms. Musumeci explained that there was precedent for both the Board and the Committee not accepting easement offers and while it did not happen frequently, there were generally several examples on an annual basis. She cited Easement Program Policy #2: Acceptance of Easements and noted that it was entirely within the Board's discretion whether or not to accept an easement. Ms. Bearns observed that the Board does not hold façade

easements and hold very few without interior protections and that this building, as part of a local historic district, would be somewhat protected. Chair Johnson asked if there was anything the owner could do to fix the issues. Ms. Musumeci responded no, several aspects of the alterations are problematic and not reversible.

With a motion from Ms. Hauser and a second from Vice-Chair Garner, the HRB voted unanimously not to accept the easement as presented.

Easement for Reconsideration:

Ms. Musumeci presented the following item:

- 1. Yeates Tract, Second Manassas Battlefield, Prince William County**
Property Owners: Marvin and Jana Yeates, under contract to the CWT
Acres: 2.58

Comprised of primarily wooded cover with some areas of open lawn, the 2.58-acre Yeates property is located in a residential subdivision near Manassas. The property falls within the core area of the Second Manassas Battlefield as determined by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission, which has given the battle a Preservation Priority Rating of I.2 Class A. The CWT intends to acquire the property in fee with grant funding assistance from the American Battlefield Protection Program (“ABPP”) and Virginia Civil War Sites Preservation Fund (“VA CWSPF”). Existing buildings and structures include one single-family dwelling built in 1972, one carport, one deck, one storage building, and one well. Ms. Musumeci noted that the Board approved this easement with conditions at its June 19, 2014, meeting. Per the request of the property owner, the CWT has asked to extend the holdover occupancy or leaseback period from two years to three years and the demolition time period for existing buildings and structures to four years. The current property owners requested extension of the lease period due to a change in family circumstances.

Ms. Musumeci stated that the Easement Acceptance Committee recommends extension of the lease period from two to three years with the following conditions:

1. The demolition period shall remain at three years from the date of expiration of the lease or termination of the lease agreement.
2. All other conditions of the Board’s approval from its June 19, 2014, meeting shall remain in effect.

Mr. Gruber asked if the extension from two to three years modified the Board’s prior approval and Ms. Musumeci responded yes.

With a motion from Mr. Gruber and a second from Ms. Peters, the HRB voted unanimously to accept the easement as presented.

Easement Program Policies

Ms. Bearns presented revisions to the following policies for the Board’s consideration, explaining that the revisions had already been presented to the Board at its September 18, 2014, meeting and October 30, 2014, training session.

1. Easement Program Policy #5: Review of Applications for Work on Easement Properties

Ms. Bearns provided the Board with background information about the Policy #5 and explained that the proposed revisions were due to changes recently made to the approvals provisions in the easement template in conjunction with the Office of the Attorney General. Ms. Bearns noted that the new approvals language could not apply retroactively and language in already recorded easements would still stand.

With a motion from Vice-Chair Garner and a second from Ms. Peters, the HRB voted unanimously to accept the revisions to *Policy #5: Review of Applications for Work on Easement Properties* as presented.

2. Easement Program Policy #11: Appraisals

Ms. Bearns provided the Board with background information about Policy #11 and explained the need for the changes.

Vice-Chair Garner asked for confirmation that if the first appraisal was conducted by the donor, the second appraisal would be authorized by the DHR director. Ms. Bearns responded that the second appraisal would be a review of the first appraisal and not necessarily an entirely new appraisal.

With a motion from Ms. Hauser and a second from Mr. Gruber, the HRB voted unanimously to accept the revisions to *Policy #11: Appraisals* as presented.

New Easements Recorded since the September 2014 HRB Meeting:

- 1. Holy Cross Abbey, Cool Spring Battlefield, Clarke County**

Amended and Restated Deed of Easement

Date Recorded: 09/08/14

Donor: Community of Cistercians of The Strict Observance, Incorporated

Acres: n/a

Ms. Bearns provided the Board with background information regarding the Holy Cross Abbey Amended and Restated Deed of Easement.

Ms. Musumeci then briefed the Board on the following recently recorded easements:

2. Gilbert's Corner Regional Park Tract, Aldie Battlefield, Loudoun County

Date Recorded: 09/19/14

Donor: Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority

Acres: 68.28

Grant Funding: American Battlefield Protection Program, Virginia Land Conservation Foundation, Transportation Enhancement

3. Battery Dantzler Tract, Ware Bottom Church Battlefield, Chesterfield County

Date Recorded: 10/28/14

Donor: Chesterfield County

Acres: 14.749

Grant Funding: American Battlefield Protection Program

Chair Johnson asked for confirmation that these were presented for information purposes only. Ms. Musumeci responded yes and noted that the Board would now be moving into closed session.

CLOSED SESSION

Chair Johnson stated that the Board would go into Closed Session at 3:10 p.m. for the purpose of discussion of a proposed resolution of an existing violation of an easement held by the HRB and that the Closed Session would be held in the Director's Conference Room of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources office. Chair Johnson asked for a motion to go into Closed Session pursuant to the Code of Virginia Section 2.2-3711(A)(7). With a motion from Vice-Chair Garner and a second from Ms. Peters, the HRB unanimously approved the motion to go into Closed Session.

Mr. Mann rejoined the meeting at 3:51 p.m.

Chair Johnson reconvened the meeting at 4:12 p.m. in the Halsey Lecture Hall of the Virginia Historical Society, read a statement in compliance with the requirements of Section 2.2-3712(D) of the Code of Virginia, and requested a roll call vote. With a motion from Ms. Hauser and a second from Ms. Peters, the HRB made a roll call vote as to Chair Johnson's statement that the closed session complied with Section 2.2-3712(D). Each Board member individually answered "yes".

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

STATE REVIEW BOARD

Chair Moore called the meeting to order at 1:45 in the Collections Study Room at the Department of Historic Resources for discussion and consideration of the Preliminary Information Applications (informal guidance session).

State Review Board Members Present

Dr. Elizabeth Moore, Chair

Dr. Luranett Lee, Vice-Chair

Joseph D. Lahendro

John Salmon

Dr. Carl Lounsbury

Dr. Sara Bon-Harper

Department of Historic Resources Staff Present

David Edwards

Jim Hare

Lena McDonald

Michael Pulice

Melina Bezirdjian

Aubrey Von Lindern

Marc Wagner

Guests (from sign-in sheet): Ray Goodloe (Bethany Presbyterian Church); David Saks (Henrico County)

Preliminary Information Applications

The following proposals were *endorsed*, unless otherwise noted, with the following comments:

Northern Region.....presented by Aubrey Von Lindern

1. **Woodyard's Blacksmith Shop, Fairfax County, #029-5736, Criterion A

Chair Moore asked how many other blacksmith shops in Virginia are in the Registers. Aubrey Von Lindern said three, with two in historic districts in Northern Virginia and one individually listed in Goochland County. Mr. Lahendro said a nomination should include discussion of the blacksmith shop's layout and where equipment was placed. Oral history information may provide useful information.

Tidewater Region.....presented by Lena McDonald

1. Temple Sinai, City of Newport News, #121-5117, Criteria A and C, Criteria Consideration A

Mr. Salmon suggested explaining the doctrinal differences between Reform and Conservative and Orthodox Judaism, and how those differences are reflected in the architectural design of the building. Mr. Lahendro asked if the selection of Modern architecture or a Modern architect was related to the synagogue's design as well. Mr. David Saks said founding members of the congregation are still alive. He noted that the front doors, stained glass windows, and steps from the sanctuary level to the altar are not original to the building. The congregation's establishment during the 1950s was related to eschewing many older Jewish traditions, which was reflected both in the building's design and in how the congregation's members dressed and seating was arranged.

Western Region.....presented by Michael Pulice

1. Natural Bridge Historic District, Rockbridge County, #081-7147, Criteria A and C

Chair Moore asked if a motel on the property had been demolished and Mr. Pulice said yes. Mr. Salmon asked if Route 11 still runs atop the Natural Bridge formation, and Mr. Pulice said yes. Chair Moore asked what part is planned to be state property. Mr. Pulice said all 1600 acres are planned to be transferred to state ownership eventually. Chair Moore asked if the caverns will be included in the historic district. Mr. Pulice said the architectural resources there postdate 1970 and the caverns themselves have not yet yielded significant archaeological deposits. It is not currently known if the caverns were open to the public more than 50 years ago. Mr. Salmon said if the caverns were included in promotional literature and advertised as part of the visitor's experience to Natural Bridge, then they could be included in the historic district boundary.

2. Pilot Mountain School, Montgomery County, #060-0008, Criteria A and C

Mr. Lahendro asked how the building compares to other schools in the area. Mr. Pulice said just two other two-room, two-story schools have been identified in the region – one in Roanoke and one in Washington County.

3. St. Paul Lutheran Church, Wythe County, #098-0145, Criterion C, Criteria Consideration A

Dr. Bon-Harper asked about the period of significance starting in the 1780s, and Mr. Pulice said that was based on the cemetery's resources. Chair Moore asked about Moravian groups who migrated into the region around the same time and how they differed from Lutherans. Mr. Lounsbury said Lutheran and Reform congregations often built a "union church" to house services for both groups. Moravians are historically unrelated to either group. The churches can be a good way to map the settlement patterns of each denomination because their locations changed very little over time. Mr. Lahendro noted the building's sophisticated design and workmanship, and asked if an architect had been identified. Mr. Pulice said the building committee's historic records do not indicate an architect, but that the building design was based on a nearby church, Hawkins Chapel, which is no longer extant.

Capital Region.....presented by Marc Wagner

1. Bethany Presbyterian Church, Charles City County, #018-0121, Criterion C, Criteria Consideration A

Mr. Lahendro asked how distinct the church's architectural design compared to others in the vicinity. Mr. Wagner said the design reportedly was influenced by an antebellum church in New Kent County. The church's high level of integrity makes it stand out. Mr. Lounsbury noted the hand-planed pews in the gallery, compared to the slightly later (ca. 1870-1895) pews in the sanctuary. Mr. Lahendro asked that the nomination discuss how the building is transitional between Greek Revival and Italianate and how it compares to other buildings of the period in the region. Mr. Lounsbury asked if it was known how communion was taken because some Presbyterian churches were designed with wide aisles between pews to allow placement of tables. Mr. Ray Goodloe said communion wafers and cups were passed among the pews.

2. Halifax Triangle and Downtown Commercial Historic District, City of Petersburg, #123-5494, Criteria A and C

Mr. Lahendro asked if this district includes the part of Petersburg that was damaged by reconfiguring streets in the 1950s to avoid construction of a bypass, and Mr. Wagner said yes. Mr. Lahendro explained that it caused the downtown area to go from being pedestrian oriented to an automobile-centric area. Much of the surrounding historic African American neighborhood was demolished at the time. The planning process for the road system was indicative of race relations at the time and failure to consult with minority residents in

transportation decisions. This historic context will be important to include in the district's statement of significance. Research materials could include newspapers articles and editorials, and older members of church congregations.

3. Oak Street AME Zion Church, City of Petersburg, #123-0100, Criteria A and C, Criteria Consideration A

Vice Chair Lee suggested checking with Virginia State University's history department to see if their research of Civil Rights-era churches includes this property. Mr. Lounsbury noted the late-Victorian-era interior finishes.

4. Petersburg Trailways Bus Station, City of Petersburg, #123-5493, Criteria A and C

Mr. Lahendro asked if a nomination for the property will include Criteria A and C, and Mr. Wagner said yes.

5. Traynham House, Halifax County, #041-5385, Criterion C

Vice-Chair Lee asked what was known about the enslaved labor force that once worked at the property and Mr. Wagner said additional research is needed. The property includes 100 acres, raising the possibility of archaeological sites associated with quarters and/or a slave cemetery. Mr. Salmon asked when the vinyl siding was installed on the house and Mr. Wagner said he didn't know but can check.

Chair Moore adjourned the SRB meeting at 3:45 p.m.